

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

KEITH L. ROBINSON,	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:13-CV-0879
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	(Chief Judge Conner)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 5th day of May, 2014, upon consideration of the report and recommendation (Doc. 34) of Chief Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson, recommending the court deny the motion (Doc. 31) to enforce the settlement agreement in the above-captioned matter, and, after an independent review of the record, and noting that the plaintiff filed objections¹ (Doc. 39) to the report on April 15, 2014, and that the United States filed a response (Doc. 40) to plaintiff's objections on April 28, 2014, and the court finding Judge Carlson's analysis to be thorough, well-reasoned, and fully supported by

¹ Where objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation are filed, the court must perform a *de novo* review of the contested portions of the report. Supinski v. United Parcel Serv., Civ. A. No. 06-0793, 2009 WL 113796, at *3 (M.D. Pa. Jan. 16, 2009) (citing Sample v. Diecks, 885 F.2d 1099, 1106 n. 3 (3d Cir. 1989); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c)). "In this regard, Local Rule of Court 72.3 requires 'written objections which . . . specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objection is made and the basis for those objections.'" Id. (citing Shields v. Astrue, Civ. A. No. 07-417, 2008 WL 4186951, at *6 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 8, 2008)).

the record, and the court further finding plaintiff's objections to be without merit and squarely addressed by Judge Carlson's report, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The report (Doc. 34) of Chief Magistrate Judge Carlson is ADOPTED in its entirety.
2. Plaintiff's motion (Doc. 31) to enforce the settlement agreement is DENIED.
3. This case remains CLOSED.

/S/ CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER

Christopher C. Conner, Chief Judge
United States District Court
Middle District of Pennsylvania